



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"a judgment will not be reversed because of contradictory instructions where it is clear to the court that the erroneous instructions did not mislead the jury." 11 ENC. PL. & PR. 149; *Imhoff v. C. M. Ry. Co.* 20 Wis. 362; *U. P. Ry. Co. v. Milliken*, 8 Kan. 647; *Garey v. Sangston*, 64 Md. 31; *Washington So. Ry. Co. v. Lacey*, 94 Va. 460; *Robbins v. Roth*, 95 Ill. 464; *Maier v. Mass. Benefit Assoc.*, 107 Mich. 687, 65 N. W. 552. In the cases representing the general rule it seems that the courts do not attempt to inquire into the effect of the contradictory instructions on the minds of the jurors. As the court said in *Boulder v. Niles*, 9 Colo. 415, 12 Pac. 632, "We cannot determine by which instruction the jury was governed." To the same effect, *McDivitt v. Des Moines City Ry. Co.* 141 Iowa, 689; 2 THOMPSON, TRIALS (2 Ed.) § 2326.

WILLS—CREATING POWER—APPOINTMENT BEFORE DEATH OF TESTATOR.—The testator's will provided for a legacy, and stipulated that in case the legatee predeceased the testator, "then I give the same to such person or persons as she may have appointed by will to receive the same, and in default of appointment, to her next of kin." A statute provided that a power might be vested in any one capable in law of holding property. The legatee died before the testator, having made a will exercising the power. *Held* that being dead at the time of vesting i. e. at the death of the testator, the legatee was not capable of taking, and hence the power never vested. *In re Mayo's Will*, (N. Y. 1912) 136 N. Y. S. 1066.

An appointment under a contingent power before it vests is good if the contingency afterwards happens: where the contingency is an event; *Countess of Sutherland v. Northmore*, 1 Dicken 56; *Dalby v. Pullen*, 2 Bing. 144; *Johnson v. Touchet*, 37 L. J. Ch. N. S. 25; *Logan v. Bell*, 1 C. B. 872; *Wandesforde v. Carrick*, Ir. R. 5 Eq. 486; *Machir v. Funk*, 90 Va. 284, 18 S. E. 197; *Hamlin v. Thomas*, 24 Wkly. Notes Cas. (Pa.) 4; or where the person in whom the power is to vest is uncertain; *Thomas v. Jones*, 2 J. & H. 475; but see *McAdam v. Logan*, 3 Brown Ch. 310, and *Garrett v. Duclos*, 128 App. Div. 508, 112 N. Y. S. 811. The contingent power must be referred to in the will purporting to execute it, in order to be well executed, *Lepley v. Smith*, 130. C. C. & R. 189; but general words of gift will operate as such appointment unless a contrary intention can be gained from the will itself, *Bayes v. Cook*, 14 Ch. D. 53. A further requisite is that the power must vest before the death of the person exercising the power. *Stillman v. Weedon*, 16 Sim. 26; *Curley v. Lynch*, 206 Mass. 289. The testator in the principal case attempted to create a power which would have been void even in the absence of statute.